

There are countless types of mathematical logic and philosophical logic, but none of them could really judge the true/false in natural languages and sciences.

The following analyses could provide the foundation for a better scientific logic.

1) Sciences are NOT consistent and complete. Even if some physicists think the problems be trivial in physics, these problems would be amplified enormously in life sciences, and especially in intelligence sciences.

2) Thus, physical sciences, life sciences, intelligence sciences need very different reference systems. Humans should not stop at the reference system theory of general relativity.

3) These different reference systems need very different logic frameworks. There are paradigm shifts across these different reference systems related to logic frameworks. So, people should be specific about what exactly these paradigm shifts are in various situations.

Gerard't Hooft

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]